

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Application of

John C. Harvey and James W. Cuddihy

Serial No. 08/477,805

Filed: June 7, 1995

For: **SIGNAL PROCESSING APPARATUS
AND METHODS**

BOX: FEE AMENDMENT

Assistant Commissioner of Patents
and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

Examiner: Luther, W.
Group Art Unit: 2731
Atty. Docket: 05634.0197

RECEIVED
SEP 22 2000
TECH CENTER 2700

**AMENDMENT AND REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION UNDER
37 C.F.R. § 1.111**

Table of Contents

I. AMENDMENTS.....	4
A. TO THE SPECIFICATION	4
B. TO THE CLAIMS	5
II. REMARKS.....	61
A. INTRODUCTION	61
1. Claim Accounting	62
2. Summary of Office Action Rejections	65
B. SUMMARY OF CLAIM AMENDMENTS	71
C. STATEMENT OF PATENTABLE NOVELTY UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111	97
D. RESPONSE TO ALLEGATION OF DEFECTIVE OATH/DECLARATION	98
E. RESPONSE TO OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION	101
F. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112	101
1. Response to Rejections under § 112, first paragraph	101
a) Response to Written Description Rejections	101
(1) The Office Action Fails to Establish a Prima Facie Rejection Under the Written Description Requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 112	101 103
(2) Applicants' Summary and Description of Integration of the Instant Specification	105
(a) "One Combined Medium" (pages 19-28)	105
(b) "The Signal Processor" through "The Normal Transmission Location" (pages 28-86) and "The Preferred Configuration of Controller, 39, and SPAM-Controller, 205C." (pages 156-162)	107
(c) "Operating Signal Processor Systems ... Introduction" through "Operating Signal Processor Systems ... Signal Record Transfer" (pages 86-278)	108

(d)	"Regulating the Reception and Use of Programming ... including Example #6" and "... Example #7" (pages 278-312) as well as "... More on Example #7 ... Combining ... Automatically to the Computer System ..." (pages 427-447).....	110
(e)	"Monitoring Receiver Station Reception and Operation" (pages 312-324).....	111
(f)	"Automating Intermediate Transmission Stations" (pages 324-390) including "Example #8" (pages 340-354).....	111
(g)	Examples #9 and #10 (pages 354-390 & 469-516): "Automating Intermediate ... Station Combined Medium Operations" (pages 354-374 of Example #9) and "Network Control of Intermediate Generating and Embedding" (pages 374-390 of Example #10) ... Regulating Station Environment	112
(h)	Automating Ultimate Receiver Stations (pages 390-427) ... Receiving Selected Programming (pages 396-406) ... Coordinating a Stereo Simulcast (pages 406-419) ...	115
	(419-427).....	116
(i)	More Disclosure in the Context of "Wall Street Week" (pages 427-469).....	116
(j)	More on Example #7 (pages 427-447).....	116
(k)	Controlling Combined Medium Operations (pages 447-457).....	117
(l)	Transmitting Program Instructions Sets (pages 457-463).....	117
(m)	Audio Overlays and Other Overlays - Viewer/Listener Station Functionalities (pages 469-516).....	118
(n)	Examples #9 and #10 Continued - Viewer/Listener Station Functionalities (pages 516-532) and The Preferred SPAM	118
(o)	Preprogramming Receiver Station Operating Systems (pages 516-532) and The Preferred SPAM	118
	Header (pages 532-533).....	119
(p)	The General Case ... Summary Example #11 (pages 533-557).....	120
(q)	Conclusion.....	121
(r)	The Subject Matter in the '81 Disclosure is Specifically Included In the Instant Specification. 121	123
(3)	35 U.S.C. § 112 Includes No Requirement That Identical Embodiments of the Invention be Described in Both a Parent Application and a Subsequent Application Claiming Priority Therefrom.....	124
(4)	Conclusion.....	124
b)	The Specification Enables One Skilled in the Art to Make and Use the Invention.....	126
(1)	"Digital" is Enabled by the Specification.....	127
(2)	"Data" is Enabled by the Specification.....	131
c)	The Best Mode of Practicing the Claimed Invention Contemplated by Applicants is Disclosed in the Specification.....	134
2.	The Claims Comply With 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.....	135
a)	The Claims Define That Which Applicants Regard as Their Invention.....	135
b)	There is no discrepancy in the use of the term "Programming".....	139
G.	RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102.....	139
1.	Rejection under 102 (b) over Applicants' U.S. Pat. Nos. '490 & '725.....	141
H.	RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103.....	141
1.	Prima Facie Case of Obviousness.....	141
2.	Rejection under 103 (a, b & e) over Applicants WO 89/02682.....	142
3.	Rejection over Greenberg, U.S. Pat. No. 4,547,804 in view of Galumbeck et al., U.S. Pat. No. 4,725,886.....	144
4.	Rejection over Jeffers et al., U.S. Pat. No. 4,739,510.....	144
5.	Rejection over Hazelwood et al., U.S. Pat. No. 4,025,851 in view of the publication "System and Apparatus for Automatic Monitoring Control of Broadcast Circuits" by Yaname et al. and Hetrich, Australian Patent No. 74,619.....	147
a)	Characterization of References.....	147
(1)	Hazelwood et al.....	149
(2)	Yaname et al.....	149
(3)	Hetrich.....	150
b)	Absence of Comparison of Cited References with Applicants' Claim Language.....	152
c)	Office Actions Improper Motivation for Combining References.....	153
(1)	Improper Combination of Hazelwood et al. in view of Yaname et al., further in view of Hetrich.....	153
(2)	Improper Combination of Hazelwood et al. and Yaname et al., further in view of Hetrich.....	153
6.	Rejection over either one of the common subject matter suggested by Campbell et al., (WO 81/02961, abandoned parent application no. 135,987, and U.S. Pat. No. 4,536,791), in view of at least one or more of: Breeze "Television Line 21 Encoded Information and Its Impact on Receiver Station Design"; Schnee, U.S. Pat. No. 4,290,142; and Zaboklicki, DE 2,904,891.....	154
a)	Office Action's Failure to Identify Applicants Claim in the Rejection.....	155
b)	Rejection further in view of Zaboklicki.....	158

7. Rejection further in view of one or more of: <i>Hazelwood et al.</i> , <i>Yaname et al.</i> , <i>Hetrich, Marsden, Young et al.</i> , "Journal of SMPTE" Oct. 1971, U.S. Pat. No. 3,761,888 to <i>Flynn</i> , U.S. Pat. No. 3,627,914 to <i>Davis, Tunmann et al.</i> , U.K. Pat. No. 959,374 to <i>Germany, Byloff, Chiddix, Skilton</i> , <i>Schiller et al.</i> , <i>Zettl, Vikene</i> , U.S. Pat. No. 4,547,804 to <i>Greenberg, Jeffers et al.</i> , <i>Diederich, Campbell et al.</i> (WO 81/02961), abandoned U.S. application no. 135,987, and U.S. Pat. No. 4,536,791), <i>Kazama et al.</i> , <i>Gosch, Stern, Breeze, Barlow, Millar</i> , U.S. Pat. No. 4,725,886 to <i>Galumbeck et al.</i> , "CBS/CCETT North American Broadcast Teletext Specification," <i>Zaboklicki</i> , U.S. Pat. No. 4,064,490 to <i>Nagel</i> , U.S. Pat. No. 4,251,691 to <i>Kakihara, Hedger et al.</i> , <i>Anderson, Gunn, Gaucher</i> , U.S. Pat. No. 4,290,142 to <i>Schnee et al.</i>	164
I. RESPONSE TO EXAMINER'S ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENT.....	166
J. RESPONSE TO OBVIOUSNESS-TYPE DOUBLE PATENTING REJECTION.....	167
1. PTO Assertions in Office Action mailed January 7, 2000.....	168
2. The Scope of the Double Patenting Doctrine.....	169
3. Patent Office Procedure.....	170
4. Nonstatutory Double Patenting.....	171
a) Standard for Determining One-Way Obviousness-Type Double Patenting.....	172
(1) Identifying the Inventions Claimed.....	173
(a) Scope of the Inventions as Defined by the Claim Language.....	175
(b) Proper Use of Specification.....	177
(c) Best Mode.....	178
(d) Means Plus Function.....	179
(2) Establishing Variations between the Invention Claimed and the Invention Defined in the Patent Claims.....	180
(3) Variations Would Have Been Obvious to a Person of Ordinary Skill in the Art.....	183
5. Conclusion.....	184
III. CONCLUSION.....	

I. AMENDMENTS

The amendments set forth below are made in response to the Non-Final Office Action mailed March 30, 2000. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner enter the following amendments in the above-captioned application and reconsider the allowability of the application as amended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111.

A. To the Specification

Applicants request entering the below amendments to the specification.

On page 1, in the paragraph entitled, "Cross-Reference to Related Applications," on the second line, please delete:

"herein incorporated by reference in its entirety".

This text was mistakenly presented in the statement of the chain of priority of the application under 35 U.S.C. § 120. The statement is surplusage as the specification of Application Number 08/113,329 is the identical specification to that of the instant application.

On page 18, line 13, please change "Fig. 6" to -- Figs. 6a and 6b --.

On page 37, line 23, delete both occurrences of "units" and replace both occurrences with -- words --.

On page 37, line 24, delete "words" and replace with -- units --.

On page 37, line 25, delete "words" and replace with -- units --.

The above amendments to the specification are being made to correct typographical errors and to make the sentence consistent with the disclosure. *See*, Applicants' specification at page 14, line 26 through page 15, line 6. No new matter is added by these amendments.